

# FISCAL NOTE

**Bill #:** HB0115

**Title:** Revise laws governing commitments to boot camp and Department of Corrections

**Primary**

**Sponsor:** Dan McGee

**Status:** Second reading, amended

---

Sponsor signature	Date	Dave Lewis, Budget Director	Date
-------------------	------	-----------------------------	------

---

## Fiscal Summary

	<b><u>FY2000 Difference</u></b>	<b><u>FY2001 Difference</u></b>
<b>Expenditures:</b>		
General Fund	\$149,600	\$149,600
State Special Revenue	22,600	22,600
<b>Revenue:</b>		
State Special Revenue	\$22,600	\$22,600
<b>Net Impact on General Fund Balance:</b>	<b>(\$149,600)</b>	<b>(\$149,600)</b>

---

<b><u>Yes</u></b>	<b><u>No</u></b>		<b><u>Yes</u></b>	<b><u>No</u></b>	
	X	Significant Local Gov. Impact		X	Technical Concerns
	X	Included in the Executive Budget		X	Significant Long-Term Impacts

---

## Fiscal Analysis

### ASSUMPTIONS:

1. A court's use of the sentencing option outlined in Section 1 cannot be predicted; therefore any cost and/or savings associated with this option cannot be estimated.
2. Section 3 provides for a probation violator prison diversion program. In Calendar Year 1998, 219 probationers were revoked and committed to the custody of the Department of Corrections (DOC). The DOC estimates that 67% could have been considered for placement in the diversion program. In addition

(continued)

to these revocations, the DOC believes that 65 probation offenders subjected to an intervention hearing may have received a jail sanction as an intermediate sanction. The DOC estimates jail costs at \$149,600 a fiscal year. This cost could be offset by the savings due to diversion of offenders from prison incarceration; however, because of the many variables involved, such savings cannot be estimated.

3. The DOC anticipates receipts of \$22,600 per fiscal year from increased supervision fees for the following services: Intensive Supervision Program (ISP) phase 1 supervision from \$10 to \$30/month, ISP phase 2 and phase 3 - \$10 to \$20/month, and extended supervision from \$10 to \$20/month. In calculating the supervision fee revenue increase, the DOC assumed that its collection rate would remain consistent with fiscal year 1998. The fiscal note assumes that these supervisory fees will not be affected by CI-75 because they are exempt as restitution charges paid to the state.

FISCAL IMPACT:

	<u>FY2000 Difference</u>	<u>FY2001 Difference</u>
<u>Expenditures:</u>		
Operating Expenses	\$172,200	\$172,200
<u>Funding:</u>		
General Fund (01)	\$149,600	\$149,600
State Special Revenue (02)	<u>22,600</u>	<u>22,600</u>
TOTAL	\$172,200	\$172,200
<u>Revenues:</u>		
State Special Revenue (02)	\$22,600	\$22,000
<u>Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Expenditure):</u>		
General Fund (01)	(\$149,600)	(\$149,600)
State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$0

TECHNICAL NOTE:

Confirmation is needed that the supervisory fees in section 8 are not subject to CI-75, because they are restitution charges paid to the state.